



# U.S. Department of Energy

Livermore Site Office, Livermore, California 94550

---

**Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**



University of California, Livermore, California 94550

UCRL-AR-220827

## **Final Five-Year Review Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300**

*Authors:*

**V. Dibley  
J. Valett\*  
L. Ferry**

*Contributors:*

**W. Daily  
R. Davis\*  
Z. Demir  
K. Heyward  
G. Lorega  
V. Madrid  
D. Mason\*  
P. McKereghan**

**December 2006**

---

\*Weiss Associates, Emeryville, California

---



**Environmental Protection Department**

Environmental Restoration Division



# **Final Five-Year Review Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300**

*Authors:*

**V. Dibley  
J. Valett\*  
L. Ferry**

*Contributors:*

**W. Daily  
R. Davis\*  
Z. Demir  
K. Heyward  
G. Lorega  
V. Madrid  
D. Mason\*  
P. McKereghan**

**December 2006**

---

\*Weiss Associates, Emeryville, California


---




**Environmental Protection Department**  
Environmental Restoration Division

## Certification

I certify that the work presented in this report was performed under my supervision. To the best of my knowledge, the data contained herein are true and accurate, and the work was performed in accordance with professional standards.




 12/18/06  
John Valett Date  
California Professional Geologist  
No. 7154  
License expires: June 30, 2007  
California Certified Hydrogeologist  
No. 826  
License expires: June 30, 2007

**Approval and Concurrence for the  
Five-Year Review for the General Services Area Operable  
Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300**

Prepared by:


The United States Department of Energy  
Livermore Site Office  
Livermore, California

Approved:



**Claire S. Holtzapple**  
Site 300 Remedial Project Manager  
U.S. Department of Energy  
National Nuclear Security Administration  
Livermore Site Office

Concurrence:



**Kathleen H. Johnson**  
Chief, Federal Facilities Cleanup Branch  
Superfund Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

## Five-Year Review Summary Form

<b>Site Identification</b>		
Site name: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300, General Services Area Operable Unit		
EPA ID: CA 2890090002		
Region: IX	State: California	City/County: San Joaquin/Alameda
<b>1.0 SITE STATUS</b>		
NPL status: Final		
Remediation status: Operating		
Multiple OUs: Yes	Construction completion date: June 2005	
Has the site been put into reuse: No		
<b>2.0 REVIEW STATUS</b>		
Reviewing agency: U.S. Department of Energy		
Author name: Valerie R. Dibley		
Author title: Assistant Site 300 Environmental Restoration Project Leader	Author affiliation: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	
Review period: November 2001 to February 2006		
Date(s) of site inspection: July 13, 2005		
Type of review: Statutory		
Review number: 2		
Triggering action: Final Record of Decision for the General Services Area OU		
Triggering action date: February 5, 1997		
Due date: October 15, 2006		

## Five-Year Review Summary Form (continued)

### Deficiencies:

No deficiencies in the remedy were identified during the five-year review process.

### Recommendations and Follow-up Actions:

The following recommendations to be carried out by the DOE were developed during the five-year review process:

1. Because cleanup standards (MCLs) have been achieved in Eastern GSA ground water, DOE/LLNL proposes to shut off the ground water extraction and treatment system and monitor ground water to determine if VOC concentrations rebound above cleanup standards after extraction ceases. Ground water in the Eastern GSA will be monitored for a period of five years following shutdown of the ground water extraction and treatment system.
2. If VOC concentrations in ground water increase above cleanup standards, reinitiation of remediation efforts will be discussed with the EPA, DTSC, and RWQCB. The ground water system will be restarted and operated until cleanup standards are achieved, unless DOE and the regulatory agencies agree otherwise. Several pumping cycle iterations may be required to achieve the cleanup standards.
3. Further optimization of Central GSA wells W-872-02 and W-873-07 operations should be considered. This may include repositioning the pumps in these wells and/or changing the pumps in order to increase ground water yield, capture, and contaminant mass removal.
4. VOC concentrations in Central GSA well W-889-01 (in the northern plume area) should be closely monitored. If concentrations increase, this well should be considered for conversion to an extraction well.
5. Optimization of the Central GSA SVE system should continue. Future optimization should include additional rebound testing to evaluate source magnitude, periodic reconfiguration of extraction versus inlet wells to optimize mass removal, and installation of individual vapor flow meters to more accurately track flow and mass removal from individual wells.
6. Because some VOCs may remain at the Central GSA following the achievement of subsurface soil cleanup standards for VOCs, a land use control will be added that prohibits the transfer of lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm under residential or unrestricted land use. This prohibition will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA ROD through a letter to the file. This letter to the file will also reference the LLNL Site 300 Integrated Strategic Plan or other appropriate institutional planning document into which this prohibition will be incorporated.

7. The changes in location-, chemical-, or action-specific requirements identified in Section 7.2 will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA ROD through a letter to the file.

No other follow-up actions were identified related to this Five-Year Review.

### **Protectiveness Statement:**

The remedy at the GSA OU is expected to be protective of human health and the environment upon completion (i.e., when clean-up levels are achieved) for the site's industrial land use. In the short-term, the remedy protects human health because exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risk to onsite workers are being controlled by the implementation of institutional controls, the Health and Safety Plan, and the Contingency Plan.

The cleanup standards for GSA ground water are to reduce VOC concentrations to meet drinking water standards. Because drinking water standards do not differentiate between industrial and residential use, the ground water cleanup remedy will be protective under any land use scenario upon completion.

The cleanup standards for subsurface soil are to reduce VOC concentrations to mitigate risk to onsite workers and prevent further impacts to ground water to the extent technically and economically feasible. Because some VOCs may remain in subsurface soil following the achievement of these cleanup standards, a land use control will be added that prohibits the transfer of lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm under residential or unrestricted land use. This restriction will remain in place until and unless a risk assessment is performed in accordance with then current U.S. EPA risk assessment guidance and is agreed by the DOE, the U.S. EPA, DTSC, and the RWQCB as adequately showing no unacceptable risk for residential or unrestricted land use. This restriction will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA through a letter to the file.

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Site Chronology.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Background.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Physical Characteristics.....	6
3.1.1. Site Description.....	6
3.1.2. Hydrogeologic Setting .....	7
3.2. Land and Resource Use.....	8
3.3. History of Contamination.....	8
3.4. Initial Response.....	9
3.5. Contaminants of Concern .....	9
3.6. Summary of Basis for Taking Action .....	10
<b>4. Remedial Actions .....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1. Remedy Selection .....	10
4.2. Remedy Implementation .....	11
4.2.1. Central GSA .....	11
4.2.2. Eastern GSA .....	13
4.3. System Operations/Operation and Maintenance.....	13
4.4 Institutional/Land Use Controls.....	14
<b>5. Progress Since Last Review .....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1. Protectiveness Statement from Last Review .....	16
5.2. Recommendations and Follow-up Actions from the 2001 Five-Year Review.....	16
5.3. Results of Implemented Actions.....	17
5.4. Status of Other Prior Issues .....	17
<b>6. Five-Year Review Process.....</b>	<b>17</b>

<b>7. Five-Year Review Findings.....</b>	<b>18</b>
7.1. Interviews and Site Inspection.....	18
7.2. Changes in Cleanup Standards and To-Be-Considered Requirements.....	19
7.3. Changes in Exposure Pathways, Toxicity, and Other Contaminant Characteristics.....	20
7.4. Data Review and Evaluation .....	20
7.4.1. Central GSA .....	20
7.4.2. Eastern GSA .....	23
<b>8. Technical Assessment .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>9. Deficiencies.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>10. Recommendations and Follow-Up Actions .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>11. Protectiveness Statement .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>12. Next Review.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>13. References .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## List of Figures

- Figure 1. Locations of LLNL Site 300 and the GSA OU.
- Figure 2. Hydrogeologic cross-section of the General Services Area.
- Figure 3. Potentiometric surface of the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> and Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSUs in the Central GSA.
- Figure 4. Potentiometric surface of the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Eastern GSA.
- Figure 5. Contaminant release sites in the GSA.
- Figure 6. Central General Services Area site map showing monitor, extraction and water-supply wells, and treatment facilities.
- Figure 7. Eastern General Services Area site map showing monitor, extraction and water-supply wells, and treatment facilities.
- Figure 8. General Services Area (GSA) land use controls.
- Figure 9. Cumulative mass of total VOCs removed from ground water and soil vapor in the GSA.
- Figure 10. Total VOC mass removal by quarter in the GSA OU.
- Figure 11. Total VOC concentrations in ground water in the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> and Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSUs in the Central GSA.

Figure 12. Time-series graphs of total VOCs in ground water for Central GSA extraction wells a) W-875-07 (Building 875 dry well pad area), b) W-70, and c) W-873-07/W-872-02.

Figure 13. Ground water capture in the Central GSA.

Figure 14. Time-series graphs of total VOCs in ground water for wells in the Central GSA northern plume area.

Figure 15. Total VOC concentration in ground water in the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Eastern GSA and vicinity.

Figure 16. Time-series isoconcentration maps of TCE in ground water in the Eastern GSA.

## List of Tables

- Table 1. Actual annual costs for the General Services Area Operable Unit for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.
- Table 2. Description of institutional/land use controls for the General Services Area (GSA) Operable Unit (OU).
- Table 3. Chemical-specific ARARs for potential chemicals of concern in ground water at the General Services Area Operable Unit.
- Table 4. Summary of trichloroethylene (TCE) data used to evaluate Central GSA Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) performance.
- Table 5. Volatile organic compound (VOC) results from the analysis of ground water samples collected from Eastern and Central GSA monitor wells, second semester 2005.

# 1. Introduction

The United States Department of Energy (DOE) has conducted a five-year review of the remedial actions implemented at the General Services Area (GSA) operable unit (OU) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Site 300. DOE is the lead agency for environmental restoration at LLNL. The review documented in this report was conducted from November 2005 through February 2006. Parties providing analyses in support of the review include:

- U.S. DOE, Livermore Site Operations Office.
- LLNL, Environmental Restoration Division.
- Weiss Associates.

The purpose of a five-year review is to evaluate the implementation and performance of a remedy to determine whether the remedy will continue to be protective of human health and the environment. The Five-Year Review report presents the methods, findings, and conclusions of the review. In addition, the Five-Year Review identifies issues or deficiencies in the selected remedy, if any, and presents recommendations to address them. The format and content of this document is consistent with guidance issued by DOE (DOE, 2000a) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (EPA, 2001).

Section 121 of the Comprehensive Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Act (SARA), requires that remedial actions which result in any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site be subject to a five-year review. The National Contingency Plan (NCP) further provides that remedial actions which result in any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure be reviewed every five years to ensure protection of human health and the environment. Consistent with Executive Order 12580, other Federal agencies are responsible for ensuring that five-year reviews are conducted at sites where five-year reviews are required or appropriate.

This is the second Five-Year Review for the GSA OU. The first Five-Year Review was completed in 2001 (Ferry, 2001). This review is considered a statutory review because: (1) contamination will remain onsite upon completion of the remedial action, (2) the Record of Decision was signed after October 17, 1986 (the effective date of the Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Act), and (3) the remedial action was selected under CERCLA. The triggering action for the first review was the date of actual remedial action onsite construction, assumed to be the signature date, February 5, 1997, of the Final Record of Decision (ROD) for the GSA OU (DOE, 1997). Five-Year Reviews are conducted individually for the other OUs at Site 300 and will be performed five years after the completion of the final Remedial Design Reports.

The background and description of the GSA OU are presented in Section 3. The following paragraphs include the descriptions and status of the other OUs and areas where environmental restoration activities are occurring at Site 300. Many of these areas and OUs were included in the Interim Site-Wide ROD for Site 300 (DOE, 2001).

**Building 834 OU** – The Building 834 facilities have been in use since the late 1950s for experiments involving thermal cycling of weapons components. From 1962 to 1978, intermittent spills and piping leaks resulted in contamination of the subsurface with trichloroethylene (TCE) and silicone oils. Nitrate contamination in ground water results from septic-system effluent but may also have natural sources. Ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment began in 1986 as treatability studies. Cleanup continued under an Interim ROD for the OU and later under the Interim Site-Wide ROD for Site 300 (DOE, 2001). DOE has periodically modified and expanded the extraction wellfield and upgraded the treatment facilities, and is conducting treatability studies to evaluate *in situ* biodegradation. Construction of the interim remedy was completed in 2004. The Five-Year Review conducted for the Building 834 OU remedial action in 2001 determined that the interim remedy was effective and protective of human health and the environment (Ferry, 2002). The next Five-Year Review for this OU is scheduled for 2007.

**Pit 6 Landfill OU** – From 1964 to 1973, waste was buried in nine unlined trenches and animal pits at the Pit 6 Landfill. Contaminants in the subsurface include volatile organic compounds (VOCs), tritium, nitrate, and perchlorate. In 1971, DOE excavated portions of the waste contaminated with depleted uranium. In 1997, a landfill cap was installed as a removal action to prevent infiltrating precipitation from further leaching contaminants from the waste. Because of decreasing TCE concentrations and tritium activities in ground water, the presence of TCE degradation products, and the short half-life of tritium (12.3 years), the selected interim remedy for TCE and tritium at the Pit 6 Landfill is monitored natural attenuation. DOE is evaluating the source, extent, and natural degradation of perchlorate and nitrate. The interim remedy for these contaminants in ground water is continued monitoring.

**High Explosives Process Area OU** – Surface spills from 1958 to 1986 resulted in the release of VOCs at the former Building 815 steam plant. High explosive compounds, nitrate, and perchlorate are present in the subsurface and are attributed to wastewater discharges to former unlined rinsewater lagoons. The High Explosives Burn Pits were capped in 1998. In 1999, DOE implemented a removal action to perform ground water extraction at the site boundary to prevent the TCE plume from migrating offsite. The selected interim remedy for this OU includes continued ground water extraction and treatment. The remedial design for the OU includes the operation of six ground water extraction and treatment systems. Buildout of the remedial action continues and construction completion is scheduled for 2007. A Five-Year Review for this OU is scheduled for 2007.

**Building 850 Firing Table** – High explosives experiments have been conducted at the Building 850 Firing Table since 1958. Tritium was used in these experiments, primarily between 1963 and 1978. As a result of the dispersal of test assembly debris during explosions, surface soil was contaminated with metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dioxins, furans, high-explosive compounds, and depleted uranium. Leaching from firing table debris has resulted in tritium and depleted uranium contamination in subsurface soil and ground water. Nitrate has also been identified in ground water. PCB-contaminated shrapnel and debris was removed from the area around the firing table in 1998. The selected remedy for the Building 850 area includes excavation of the contaminated surface soil and a nearby sandpile as a final remedy and monitored natural attenuation of tritium in ground water as an interim remedy. DOE is currently evaluating alternate technologies to address the PCB-contaminated

soil due to significant cost increases for offsite disposal of the soil. A Five-Year Review for this OU is scheduled for 2009.

**Pit 7 Landfill Complex** – The Pit 3, 4, 5, and 7 Landfills are collectively designated the Pit 7 Landfill Complex. Firing table debris containing tritium, depleted uranium, and metals was placed in the pits in the 1950s through the 1980s. The Pit 4 and 7 Landfills were capped in 1992. Ongoing releases of contaminants to ground water are occurring. DOE has completed an area-specific Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (Taffet, 2005). A preferred remedy is presented in the Proposed Plan for Environmental Cleanup at the Pit 7 Complex (DOE, 2006). An interim remedy for the Pit 7 Complex will be selected in an Amendment to the Interim Site-Wide ROD in 2006. The interim remedy is scheduled for implementation in 2007.

**Pit 2 Landfill** – The Pit 2 Landfill was used from 1956 to 1960 to dispose of firing table debris and gravel. No unacceptable risk or hazard to human health or ecological receptors has been associated with the Pit 2 Landfill. Recent data indicate possible releases of depleted uranium from the landfill. The selected interim remedy for the Pit 2 Landfill is enhanced vadose zone and ground water monitoring to detect any future releases from the landfill. Deficiencies in the selected remedy will be addressed in the upcoming Site-Wide Remediation Evaluation Summary Report.

**Building 854 OU** – TCE was released to soil and ground water through leaks and discharges of heat-exchange fluid, primarily between 1967 and 1984. Other contaminants in ground water include nitrate and perchlorate. Some TCE-contaminated soil was excavated in 1983. PCB, dioxin, and furan contaminated soil was excavation in 2005. Treatability studies to assess VOC, nitrate, and perchlorate extraction and treatment began in 1999. The selected interim remedy for this OU includes ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment. The remedial design for the OU includes the construction and operation of three ground water and one soil vapor extraction and treatment systems. Buildout of the remedial action continues and construction completion is scheduled for 2007. A Five-Year Review for this OU is scheduled for 2008.

**Building 832 Canyon OU** – TCE was released to soil and ground water through leaks and discharges of heat-exchange fluid at Buildings 830 and 832 between the late 1950s and 1985. Nitrate and perchlorate are also present in ground water. In 1999, DOE began a treatability study to evaluate ground water and soil vapor extraction at Building 832. The selected interim remedy for this OU includes continued soil vapor and ground water extraction and treatment. The remedial design for the OU includes the construction and operation of four ground water and two soil vapor extraction and treatment systems. Buildout of the remedial action continues and construction completion is scheduled for 2007. A Five-Year Review for this OU is scheduled for 2011.

**Building 801 Dry Well and the Pit 8 Landfill** – Waste fluid was discharged to a dry well located adjacent to Building 801D from the late 1950s to 1984, resulting in minor subsurface VOC contamination. The Pit 8 Landfill was used to dispose of debris from the Building 801 Firing Table until an earthen cover was installed in 1974. There is no evidence of a contaminant release from the landfill. The selected interim remedy for this area is enhanced vadose zone and ground water monitoring to detect any future releases from the landfill.

**Building 833** – TCE was used as a heat-exchange fluid in the Building 833 area from 1959 to 1982 and was released through spills and rinsewater disposal, resulting in minor VOC contamination of the shallow soil/bedrock and perched ground water. The selected interim remedy for this area is continued monitoring.

**Building 845 Firing Table and Pit 9 Landfill** – High explosives experiments were conducted at the Building 845 Firing Table from 1958 to 1963. Leaching from firing table debris resulted in minor contamination of subsurface soil with depleted uranium and high-explosive compounds. No ground water contamination has been detected. The Pit 9 Landfill was used to dispose of firing table debris generated at the Building 845 Firing Table. The debris buried in the pit may contain tritium, uranium, and/or high-explosive compounds. However, there is no evidence of a contaminant release from the Pit 9 Landfill. No unacceptable risk or hazard was identified in either area. The selected interim remedy for this area is enhanced vadose zone and ground water monitoring to detect any future releases from the landfill.

**Building 851 Firing Table** – The Building 851 Firing Table has been used for high-explosives research since 1982. These experiments resulted in minor VOC, depleted uranium, metals, and high-explosives contamination in soil and ground water. No unacceptable risk or hazard was identified in this area. The selected interim remedy for this area is continued monitoring.

**Advanced Test Accelerator (Building 865)** – Solvents were used at this facility, and Freon-113 has been detected in the subsurface. DOE is currently investigating this area.

**Building 812** – This facility has been in use since the 1960s. Gravel from the firing table was pushed into an adjacent ravine or to the side of the table. A Characterization Summary Report for this area was submitted in 2005 (Ferry and Holtzapple, 2005a). Depleted uranium has been identified as a contaminant of concern (COC) in soil and ground water. Perchlorate and nitrate were also identified as COCs in ground water. A treatability study is planned for the extraction and treatment of ground water while the CERCLA pathway for this area is negotiated.

**Sandia Test Facility** – From about 1959 to 1960, Sandia National Laboratories (Livermore) operated a small, temporary firing table at Site 300. The facility consisted of a portable building with other structures built into the hillside and surrounded by sandbags. The facility may have been used to test or store high explosives. A Characterization Summary Report for this area was submitted in 2005 (Ferry and Holtzapple, 2005b). The characterization data indicate no significant releases of contamination have occurred to the environment as a result of activities in this area. DOE has proposed No Further Action for the Sandia Test Site area.

## 2. Site Chronology

The following chronology summarizes important events relevant to environmental restoration in the GSA OU:

### 1955

- LLNL Site 300 was established as a DOE high-explosives test facility.

1960s/1970s

- Solvents from the craft shops were discharged to dry wells in the Central GSA.
- Volatile organic compound (VOC)-contaminated rinsewater was discharged to the ground surface at the Building 879 steam-cleaning/sink facility.
- VOC-contaminated shop debris was disposed in Eastern GSA trenches.

1970s/1980s

- Solvent spills from drum rack occurred.

1982

- Site investigations began in the GSA OU.

1990

- LLNL Site 300 was placed on the National Priorities List.

1991

- Ground water extraction and treatment began in the Eastern GSA as a removal action.

1992

- A Federal Facility Agreement for Site 300 was signed. The parties to the Agreement included DOE, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

1993

- Ground water extraction and treatment began in the Central GSA as a removal action.

1994

- Soil vapor extraction and treatment began in the Central GSA as a removal action.

1994

- The Site-Wide Remedial Investigation report (Webster-Scholten, 1994) was issued.

1995

- A Feasibility Study for the GSA OU was issued (Rueth et al., 1995).

1996

- The Proposed Plan for Environmental Cleanup of the GSA OU issued (DOE, 1996).
- A point-of-use Memorandum of Understanding was established with the nearby landowners.

1997

- A Record of Decision for the GSA OU signed.
- Ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment began as a remedial action.

1998

- The Remedial Design document for the GSA OU was issued (Rueth et al., 1998).

1999

- The Phase I expansion of the Central GSA extraction wellfield was completed.

2001

- The Five-Year Review for the GSA OU was issued (Ferry et al., 2001).

2005

- The Phase II expansion of the Central GSA extraction wellfield was completed.

## 3. Background

### 3.1. Physical Characteristics

#### 3.1.1. Site Description

LLNL Site 300 is a U.S. DOE experimental test facility operated by the University of California. It is located in the Eastern Altamont Hills 17 miles east of Livermore, California (Figure 1). At Site 300, DOE conducts research, development, and testing associated with high-explosive materials. During previous Site 300 operations, a number of contaminants were released to the environment. These releases occurred primarily from spills, leaking pipes, leaching from unlined landfills and pits, high-explosive test detonations, and disposal of waste fluids in lagoons and dry wells (sumps).

The GSA OU is located in the southeast corner of Site 300 (Figure 1). Within the GSA are a number of craft shops, storage buildings, and offices that support the research being conducted at Site 300. The GSA has been separated into the Central GSA and the Eastern GSA based on differences in hydrogeology and the distribution of environmental contaminants. The majority of structures are located in the Central GSA. The Eastern GSA contains a sewage treatment and adjacent overflow ponds. The offsite area adjacent to the GSA is sparsely populated and used for agriculture. The nearest major population center (Tracy, California) is 8.5 miles to the northeast.

There are no environmentally sensitive areas on Site 300 property within the GSA OU. However, the California Department of Fish and Game operates an ecological preserve immediately northeast of the GSA along Corral Hollow Creek. Administrative controls are in place to minimize any potential detrimental impacts on the preserve from the GSA cleanup, including managing of ground water treatment system discharges to prevent surface water from reaching the preserve during the summer months.

### 3.1.2. Hydrogeologic Setting

The vadose zone and three primary hydrostratigraphic units (HSUs) in the GSA OU are described below, from shallowest to deepest. A southwest-northeast oriented hydrogeologic cross-section through the GSA is presented in Figure 2.

#### 3.1.2.1. Vadose (Unsaturated) Zone

The vadose zone in the western portion of the Central GSA is comprised of the unsaturated portion of the Quaternary alluvial terrace (Qt) silty clay, sand, and gravel deposits, and the underlying Tertiary Neroly Upper Blue Sandstone (Tnbs<sub>2</sub>). These deposits are unsaturated to a depth of approximately 10 to 20 feet below ground surface (bgs). The vadose zone is contaminated with VOCs in the vicinity of the Building 875 former dry wells.

In the eastern portion of the Central GSA (near the sewage treatment pond) and the Eastern GSA, the vadose zone is comprised of the unsaturated portion of the Quaternary alluvial (Qal) silty clay, sand, and gravel deposits and the underlying Tertiary Neroly Lower Blue Sandstone (Tnbs<sub>1</sub>). In the Eastern GSA, these deposits are unsaturated to a depth of approximately 10 to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs). There is no significant contamination present in unsaturated Qal and Tnbs<sub>1</sub> units in the Eastern GSA.

#### 3.1.2.2. Saturated Zone

There are three primary HSUs in the GSA OU. An HSU consists of one or more stratigraphic intervals that comprise a water-bearing zone exhibiting similar hydraulic and geochemical properties. The three HSUs identified beneath the GSA include:

- Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU, a shallow water-bearing zone in the western portion of the Central GSA.
- Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU, a deeper regional aquifer within the western portion of the Central GSA.
- Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU, a shallow water-bearing zone within the eastern portion of the Central GSA and throughout the Eastern GSA.

In the western portion of the Central GSA, the shallow Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU includes saturated Qt deposits, and the Tnbs<sub>2</sub> sandstone and Tnsc<sub>1</sub> siltstone/claystone bedrock units that subcrop beneath the Qt. Unconfined ground water occurs in the Tnbs<sub>2</sub> sandstone. The Tnsc<sub>1</sub> siltstone/claystone primarily acts as an aquitard between the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU and the deeper Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer, but also contains variable saturation. The depth to ground water in the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU is 10 to 20 ft bgs, and ground water flows toward the south and east at a velocity of 0.05 to 0.10 ft/day. A potentiometric surface elevation contour map for the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Central GSA is presented as Figure 3. The Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer underlies the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU in the western portion of the Central GSA and consists of Tnbs<sub>1</sub> sandstone bedrock that is hydraulically separate from the overlying Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU. The Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer is separated into upper and lower units by a ten-foot thick claystone marker bed that exists throughout the southeast corner of Site 300. Depth to ground water in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in this area varies from 12 to 100 feet bgs and ground water flows to the south-southeast. Ground water velocity in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer is approximately 0.3 feet per day.

In the eastern portion of the Central GSA (near the sewage treatment pond) and throughout the Eastern GSA, the Qt deposits and the Tnbs<sub>2</sub> and Tnsc<sub>1</sub> bedrock units are not present. Qal

deposits directly overlie the shallow Tnbs<sub>1</sub> bedrock that comprises the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in this area. In the Eastern GSA, the hydraulic conductivity of the alluvium is significantly greater than in the Qt and Tnbs<sub>2</sub> bedrock in the western part of the Central GSA. The depth to ground water in Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU is 10 to 15 ft bgs. Ground water in the Qal flows toward the east and north at a velocity of 0.5 to 3 feet per day; ground water flow in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> is generally toward the south. A potentiometric surface elevation contour map for the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Eastern GSA is presented as Figure 4.

### 3.2. Land and Resource Use

Prior to DOE establishing Site 300 as remote testing facility in 1955, the area was used for cattle grazing. Site 300 is currently an operating facility, and will remain under DOE control for the reasonably anticipated future. Craft shops, storage buildings, and offices in the Central GSA are still used to support the research conducted at Site 300. Land in the Eastern GSA is undeveloped and is not used for LLNL programmatic activities. There are no active onsite water-supply wells in the GSA. Two former onsite water-supply wells in the Central GSA were sealed and abandoned in 1988 and 1990 due to the detection of TCE in samples from these wells.

There are no planned modifications or proposed development of the offsite land adjacent to the GSA. Current offsite land use near the GSA includes cattle grazing, private residences, and an ecological preserve. Offsite, several private water-supply wells are in use for domestic and agricultural uses. These offsite wells are monitored regularly and no contamination from the GSA has been detected in these wells since 2001.

### 3.3. History of Contamination

The eight confirmed contaminant release sites in the GSA are shown on Figure 5 and listed below:

1. The Building 879 Steam-Cleaning/Sink facility.
2. Former dry well 875-S1.
3. Former dry well 875-S2.
4. A decommissioned solvent drum rack and underground solvent retention tank.
5. Former dry well 872-S.
6. Former dry well 873-S.
7. A former debris burial trench west of the sewage treatment pond in the Central GSA.
8. Several former debris burial trenches north of the sewage treatment overflow pond in the Eastern GSA.

Solvents containing VOCs were commonly used as degreasing agents in craft shops in the Central GSA. Rinse water from these operations was disposed of in dry wells. Typically, the dry wells in the Central GSA were gravel-filled pits 3 to 4 feet deep and 2 feet across. The dry wells were used until 1982 and were all excavated in 1983 to 1984.

In the Eastern GSA, various types of debris were disposed of in debris burial trenches during the 1960s and 1970s. Some of this debris was contaminated with small quantities of VOCs. Trenching of the debris burial area, interviews with former and present employees, and examination of aerial photographs indicate that the trenches contain primarily metal, ceramic, and glass debris from the craft shops.

### 3.4. Initial Response

DOE began environmental investigations in the GSA in 1982. Since then, over 100 monitor wells have been installed to characterize the vertical and horizontal extent of contamination throughout the GSA and to measure ground water elevations. Other site characterization methods included soil sampling, soil vapor surveys, hydraulic testing, colloidal borescope investigations, and geophysical surveys. Test pits were also used to determine the extent of burial trenches and contamination in the Eastern GSA.

Pre-ROD remediation activities at the GSA included:

- Excavating and backfilling all dry wells.
- Sealing and abandoning impacted or threatened water-supply wells.
- Removal actions to begin ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment.

### 3.5. Contaminants of Concern

The primary contaminant of concern found in ground water and soil at the GSA is TCE, comprising approximately 90% of the total VOCs. TCE is a suspected human carcinogen. Other contaminants of concern identified in the GSA include tetrachloroethylene (PCE), cis-1,2-dichloroethylene (DCE), 1,1-DCE, 1,1,1-trichloroethane (TCA), acetone, benzene, toluene, xylenes, bromodichloromethane, chloroform, trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11), and 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (Freon 113).

In the Central GSA, the highest prerediation concentration of TCE in soil was 360 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), detected below the Building 875 dry wells. The prerediation concentration of total VOCs in ground water was approximately 272,000 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). The 2005 maximum total VOC concentration was 547  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (see Section 7.4). Globules of TCE (a Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid, or DNAPL) were observed in some ground water samples. The baseline human health risk assessment conducted in 1991 estimated a maximum excess carcinogenic risk of  $7 \times 10^{-2}$  if ground water from a hypothetical water-supply well located at the site boundary near the Building 875 dry wells were to be ingested over a 70-yr period (risk values below  $10^{-6}$  are considered protective). The corresponding noncarcinogenic hazard index was 560 (hazard indices below 1 are considered protective). The baseline risk assessment also estimated an excess cancer risk to onsite workers from TCE vapors migrating into Building 875 of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ .

In the Eastern GSA, the highest prerediation concentration of total VOCs detected in shallow ground water near the debris burial trench was approximately 74  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . Prior to the start of remediation, the plume of TCE in ground water exceeding the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 5  $\mu\text{g/L}$  extended approximately 4,200 feet offsite. Very low concentrations of VOCs

(maximum of 0.017 mg/kg) were detected in the vadose zone beneath the debris trenches in the Eastern GSA. The 1991 baseline human health risk assessment estimated an excess carcinogenic risk of  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  for ingesting ground water from a hypothetical water-supply well located at the site boundary near the debris burial trench. The risk associated with potential use of contaminated ground water at two offsite wells (CDF-1 and SR-1) was approximately  $10^{-5}$ . No unacceptable risk or hazard was associated with potential exposure to VOCs in surface or subsurface soil. As discussed in Section 7.4.1.2. below, soil vapor extraction has contributed to reducing the excess cancer risk due to inhalation of VOC vapors migrating into Building 875 from  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  prior to remediation to  $9.5 \times 10^{-7}$  in 2000. Inhalation risk within Building 875 is no longer of concern.

### 3.6. Summary of Basis for Taking Action

Remedial actions were initiated in the GSA OU to address unacceptable human health risks associated with subsurface contamination at the GSA OU including: (1) potential ingestion of ground water containing VOCs at concentrations exceeding drinking water MCLs, and (2) onsite worker inhalation exposure to TCE volatilizing from the subsurface soil to indoor air within Building 875. The remedial actions were also initiated to restore the beneficial uses of ground water in this area. The remedial action objectives for the GSA cleanup are discussed in Section 4.1.

## 4. Remedial Actions

### 4.1. Remedy Selection

The remedy selected for the GSA OU is intended to achieve the following Remedial Action Objectives:

#### Protection of Human Health:

- Prevent human ingestion of the ground water containing VOC concentrations (single carcinogen) above the State and Federal drinking water MCLs, a cumulative excess cancer risk (all carcinogens) greater than  $10^{-6}$ , and a cumulative hazard index (all noncarcinogens) greater than 1.
- Prevent human inhalation of VOCs in vapor in concentrations above those that pose an excess cancer risk of  $10^{-6}$ .

#### Protection of the Environment:

- Restore water quality, at a minimum, to water quality objectives that are protective of beneficial uses (i.e., MCLs).

The cleanup standard for ground water in the GSA OU is to reduce VOC concentrations to MCLs in all impacted ground water. VOCs in the vadose (unsaturated) zone will be remediated to the extent technically and economically feasible to minimize further degradation of the ground water by contaminants in the vadose zone. The vadose zone cleanup will be completed when it is demonstrated that: (1) VOCs remaining in the vadose zone no longer cause concentrations in

the leachate to exceed the ground water cleanup standards, based on an interpretation of soil vapor data using an appropriate vadose zone model, and (2) VOCs have been removed to the extent technically and economically feasible to meet the ground water cleanup levels sooner, more cost-effectively, and more reliably. Another cleanup standard is to mitigate the excess cancer risk from inhalation of indoor air within Building 875 caused by VOCs migrating into the building from the subsurface. This objective has been met as described in Section 7.4.

The remedy for the GSA was selected based on the capacity to contain contaminant sources, prevent further plume migration, remove contaminant mass from the subsurface, and protect human health and the environment both onsite and offsite. In the remedial design phase, DOE considered hydrogeologic factors, contaminant characteristics, available remedial technologies, and effective performance monitoring techniques. The selected remedy for the GSA consists of:

- Ground water extraction and treatment in the Central GSA.
- Soil vapor extraction and treatment at the Building 875 dry well area in the Central GSA.
- Ground water extraction and treatment in the Eastern GSA.
- Regular ground water and soil vapor monitoring.
- Institutional controls, such as access/land-use restrictions and measures to prevent use of contaminated ground water.

## 4.2. Remedy Implementation

Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 present a summary of the actions DOE has taken to implement the selected remedy in the GSA OU, and also describe any significant modifications to the remedy since the Final ROD (DOE, 1997) and Remedial Design (Rueth et al., 1998) documents for the GSA OU. Information on the performance of the remedy and the current concentrations and distribution of contamination is included in Section 7.4.

### 4.2.1. Central GSA

The Central GSA remediation system consists of ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment as described in Sections 4.2.1.1. and 4.2.2.2. A map of the Central GSA, showing the locations of monitoring and extraction wells and treatment facilities is presented in Figure 6.

#### 4.2.1.1. Ground Water

Ground water cleanup began in the Central GSA in 1993 using four extraction wells at the Building 875 dry well release area. The ROD and Remedial Design documents included plans to evaluate expansion of the shallow aquifer ground water extraction wellfield to include other contaminant sources and the downgradient extent of the VOC plume. Three extraction wells were added in 1999 (the Phase I wellfield expansion). Two of these extraction wells were installed at the Building 872 and Building 873 dry well VOC release sites (wells W-872-02 and W-873-07, respectively). The third well (W-70) was installed hydraulically downgradient from the Building 875 dry well release area.

DOE presented a Phase II wellfield expansion work plan in 2000. With regulatory concurrence, the Phase II plan screened out six potential extraction wells that had been included

in the remedial design (W-873-06, W-7S, W-7F, W-7T, W-7Q, and W-875-03), due to low contaminant concentrations and/or low well yields. The Phase II plan initially proposed the conversion of monitoring wells W-7R and W-7P to extraction wells. However, during the previous Five-Year Review (2001), W-7P was screened out as an extraction well because of decreasing VOC concentrations in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU regional aquifer and the potential risk of drawing contaminants downward into the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU from the overlying Qal HSU by pumping this well. The 2001 review also stated that DOE would reconsider extraction from well W-7P if VOC concentrations in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU regional aquifer did not continue to decline.

Since the last Five-Year Review, VOC concentrations in samples of Tnbs<sub>1</sub> ground water collected from well W-7P have fluctuated from approximately 10 to 20 µg/L. The overall trend of total VOC concentrations in this well has been relatively stable over time. Therefore, DOE began pumping from well W-7P in 2005 to remove VOCs from Tnbs<sub>1</sub> ground water. Well W-7P is pumped at very low flow rates to prevent drawing contamination in Qal ground water into the Tnbs<sub>1</sub>. Because well W-7P is screened over only 9 feet in the uppermost portion of the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> and ground water elevation data indicate W-7P is hydraulically connected to the Qal ground water in this area, low-flow pumping of W-7P should not result in further contamination of Tnbs<sub>1</sub> ground water. VOC concentrations and water levels in well W-7P and surrounding wells are monitored closely.

The Phase II expansion of the Central GSA extraction wellfield was completed in September 2005. New ground water extraction wells W-7R and W-7P began pumping in May and October 2005, respectively. Contaminated ground water is currently extracted from eight wells (W-7I, W-875-07, W-875-08, W-873-07, W-872-02, W-7O, W-7P, and W-7R). The current ground water extraction and treatment system configuration includes particulate filtration to remove sediment, air stripping to remove VOCs from extracted water, and granular activated carbon (GAC) to treat vapor effluent from the air stripper. Treated ground water is discharged to the surrounding natural vegetation using misting towers.

#### **4.2.1.2. Vadose Zone**

In July 1994, DOE began soil vapor extraction at the Building 875 dry well contaminant source area as a removal action. The soil vapor extraction wellfield and treatment system described in the GSA ROD and Remedial Design documents is fully implemented. Wells W-7I, W-875-07, W-875-08, and W-875-10 are used to extract soil vapor and W-875-09, W-875-11 and W-875-15 are currently used as passive air inlet wells. Simultaneous ground water extraction in the vicinity lowers the elevation of the ground water surface and maximizes the volume of unsaturated soil influenced by vapor extraction. Extraction well W-7I was discontinued in November 2005 due to the lack of flow. Additional vacuum was applied to the remaining wells (W-875-07, W-875-08, and W-875-10) to increase soil vapor rates and ground water yields.

The current soil vapor treatment system consists of a water knockout chamber, a rotary vane blower, and four 140-pound (lb) vapor-phase GAC columns arranged in series. Treated vapors are discharged to the atmosphere under permit from the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

### 4.2.2. Eastern GSA

DOE began ground water remediation at the Eastern GSA in 1991 as a removal action and continued as a remedial action after the GSA ROD. An offsite ground water extraction and treatment facility was included in the remedial design. However, since the existing extraction configuration has been extremely successful in controlling offsite contaminant migration, this offsite facility was determined not to be needed. The regulatory agencies concurred with the decision not to install this facility.

Currently, contaminated ground water is extracted from the Qal portion of the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU using three wells yielding approximately 15 gpm each. Initially, air sparging was used to treat extracted ground water, but a treatability study conducted in 1995-1996 indicated that treatment using aqueous-phase GAC was a simpler and more efficient technology at the site, and a GAC system was installed in 1997. The current treatment configuration includes particulate filtration, contaminant adsorption by aqueous-phase GAC using three 1,000-lb vessels arranged in series, and surface discharge to Corral Hollow Creek. The locations of ground water monitoring and extraction wells and treatment facility are shown in Figure 7.

### 4.3. System Operations/Operation and Maintenance

In general, the three extraction and treatment systems are operating as designed and no significant operations, performance, maintenance, or cost issues were identified during the review. All required documentation is in place, and treatment system operations and maintenance (O&M) activities are consistent with established procedures and protocols.

O&M procedures are contained in the following documents:

- Health and Safety Plan, Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan, Compliance Monitoring Plan, and Contingency Plan for the GSA OU, contained within the Remedial Design document (Rueth et al., 1998).
- Operations and Maintenance Manual, Volume VI: Central General Services Area Vapor and Ground Water Treatment Facilities (Daily, 2004).
- Eastern GSA Treatment Facility Operations Checklist (LLNL, 1999).
- Central GSA: Substantive Requirements and the Monitoring and Reporting Program issued by the California RWQCB and the Permit to Operate issued by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.
- Eastern GSA: Substantive Requirements and the Monitoring and Reporting Program issued by the RWQCB.

Monitoring and optimizing the performance and efficiency of the three extraction and treatment systems comprises a large portion of the O&M activities. Extracted ground water is sampled at multiple points during the treatment process to ensure compliance with discharge requirements. Treatment system parameters such as pressure, flow, and temperature are recorded weekly to anticipate potential mechanical problems. Monitor and extraction wells are sampled per the requirements of the GSA Compliance Monitoring Plan (Rueth et al., 1998) and Substantive Requirements. Semi-annual reports submitted to the regulatory agencies document

all analytic results, O&M activities, and system performance data. Routine maintenance is performed on the monitor and extraction wells as needed.

The major O&M activity at the Central GSA ground water treatment facility is to ensure maximum operating efficiency of the air stripper. The internal air pressure within the air stripper is closely monitored. When this pressure reaches a pre-determined point (indicating buildup of scaling within the packing elements), the system is overhauled to ensure maximum efficiency of VOC removal from extracted ground water. Other O&M activities include injecting anti-scaling compounds, removing iron oxide buildup, maintaining remote computer access and data collection capabilities, protecting the unit from freezing in cold weather, and periodically replacing spent vapor-phase GAC.

The major O&M activities at the Central GSA soil vapor treatment facility are monitoring the performance of the system and replacing spent vapor-phase GAC. The vapors treated by the primary GAC vessel (the first of four in series) are tested regularly for VOC breakthrough. When breakthrough occurs in the effluent of the primary vessel, the effluent of the secondary vessel is tested until breakthrough occurs. Upon VOC breakthrough from the secondary vessel, both the primary and secondary GAC vessels are replaced. Other O&M issues include ensuring the temperature within the GAC drums remains within the optimal range and optimizing the performance of the soil vapor extraction and ambient air injection wells.

DOE's major O&M activity at the Eastern GSA ground water treatment facility is replacing the 3,000 lbs of aqueous-phase GAC. The extracted ground water treated by the primary GAC vessel (the first of three in series) is sampled and analyzed regularly for VOCs. When VOCs break through the primary vessel, the effluent of the secondary vessel is tested until breakthrough occurs. Upon breakthrough from the secondary vessel, the GAC in both the primary and secondary vessels is replaced.

The ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment systems in the Central GSA have consistently operated in compliance with all permits and requirements. The Eastern GSA ground water extraction and treatment system has also been in compliance with the exception that TCE was detected in the effluent slightly above the detection limit ( $0.5 \mu\text{g/L}$ ) in February 2001, November 2002, and February 2004. The causes of the contaminant breakthrough were quickly identified and appropriate corrective actions were taken (replacement of aqueous-phase GAC). No regulatory action was taken.

The budgeted and actual costs associated with the management, investigation, testing, modeling, design, construction, and O&M of the environmental remediation activities within the GSA are tracked closely. The GSA OU has consistently operated well below the estimated annual operating costs reported in the ROD. Table 1 presents the actual costs for the last five fiscal years, 2001 through 2005.

#### **4.4 Institutional/Land Use Controls**

Institutional/land use controls are non-engineered actions or measures used to prevent or limit the potential for human exposure to contamination at the GSA OU and to protect the integrity of the remedy. The general types of institutional/land use controls that are used to

prevent human exposure to contamination at the GSA OU include:

- Access controls – Measures such as fences, signs, and security forces that are used to prevent exposure by controlling and/or restricting access to areas of contamination.
- Administrative controls – Measures such as pre-construction review and controls for limiting or restricting access to contaminated areas and prohibitions on water-supply well drilling.

Table 2 presents a description of: (1) the institutional/land use control objective and duration, (2) the risk necessitating land use controls, and (3) the specific institutional/land use controls and implementation mechanisms used to prevent exposure to contamination at the GSA OU. Figure 8 shows the specific areas of the GSA OU where the institutional/land use controls will be implemented and maintained.

Monitoring and inspection of the GSA OU will be performed throughout the remediation period to determine whether the institutional/land use controls remain protective and consistent with all remedial action objectives. In addition, DOE will review facility and land use to evaluate changes in exposure pathway conditions that could affect the risk assessment assumptions and calculations.

Institutional/land use controls are included in the Risk and Hazard Management Program contained in the GSA Compliance Monitoring Plan. Any new or modified institutional/land use controls resulting from the Five-Year Review process will be incorporated in the Risk and Hazard Management Program contained in the revised Site-Wide Compliance Monitoring Plan. Risk and hazard monitoring results conducted during the year are submitted to the U.S. EPA and State regulatory agencies in the Annual Site 300 Site-Wide Compliance Monitoring Reports. In addition, DOE will work with LLNL Site 300 Management to incorporate these institutional/land use controls into the Site 300 Integrated Strategic Plan or other appropriate institutional planning documents.

The land use controls and requirements described herein are only applicable to the GSA OU and associated contaminated environmental media that are being addressed through the CERCLA process. DOE will implement, maintain, and enforce these institutional/land use controls at the GSA OU for as long as necessary to keep the selected remedy protective of human health and the environment.

The institutional/land use controls described in this section and in Table 2, and Figure 8 showing the specific areas of the GSA where the institutional/land use controls will be implemented and maintained, will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA Record of Decision through a letter to the file.

If DOE later transfers these procedural responsibilities to another party by contract, property transfer agreement, or through another means, DOE will retain ultimate responsibility for the integrity of the remedy. In the event that the property is transferred in the future, DOE will execute a land use covenant at the time of transfer in compliance with Title 22 CCR, Division 4.5, Chapter 39, Section 67391.1. If the Site 300 property were to be transferred to an entity outside the U.S. Department of Energy, the necessary institutional/land use controls would be determined prior to the property transfer based on: (1) the intended land use subsequent to the property transfer, and (2) contamination and associated risk, if any, remaining at the GSA OU.

## 5. Progress Since Last Review

This section describes the Protectiveness Statement and recommendations and follow-up actions from the previous GSA Five-Year Review (Ferry et al., 2001). It also describes the status of the actions recommended in this previous review.

### 5.1. Protectiveness Statement from Last Review

The 2001 GSA Five-Year Review indicated that the remedy for the GSA OU was protective of human health and the environment. The Health and Safety Plan and the Contingency Plan are in place, sufficient to control risks, and properly implemented. Ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment are effectively controlling the migration of contaminants, and reducing contaminant concentrations in the subsurface as needed to meet cleanup standards in the time frame anticipated at the time of the ROD. Institutional controls are in place to prevent use of contaminated ground water.

No deficiencies in the remedy were identified during the previous Five-Year Review conducted in 2001.

### 5.2. Recommendations and Follow-up Actions from the 2001 Five-Year Review

The following recommendations were developed during the Five-Year Review process in 2001:

1. A high priority should be given to optimizing ground water and soil vapor extraction well placement and pumping rates to maximize contaminant capture within the existing wellfields and shorten the time required to reach cleanup standards.
2. Additional ground water extraction wells located north of Building 875 should be considered. Although VOC concentrations in ground water in this area are relatively low (maximum of 46  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), the lateral extent of this plume is limited and ground water extraction may accelerate achievement of cleanup standards throughout the GSA.
3. Contaminants in the regional aquifer in the Central GSA should be closely monitored, but extraction should be considered only if data indicate that the current declining concentration trend does not continue.
4. In the Eastern GSA, DOE should consider the possibility of undetected VOC mass if ground water remediation does not continue its current progress toward achieving cleanup standards.

If DOE and the regulatory agencies agree to incorporate any or all of these recommendations, implementation milestones can be added to the schedule in the Federal Facility Agreement for Site 300, and/or administered less formally by inclusion in the minutes of the Remedial Project Manager's monthly meetings.

No other follow-up actions were identified in the 2001 Five-Year Review.

### 5.3. Results of Implemented Actions

The status of actions taken in response to the recommendations listed in Section 5.2 are as follows:

1. During 2005, wells W-7R and W-7P were added to the Central GSA extraction wellfield to increase contaminant mass removal and capture as part the Phase II wellfield expansion. A rebound test was conducted in 2003 and 2004 to evaluate the magnitude of the remaining VOC source in the vadose zone. The Phase II wellfield expansion and the SVE rebound test are discussed in Section 7.4. VOC data from ground water and soil vapor extraction wells are used to adjust system operations to optimize their effectiveness in removing contaminant mass and reducing concentrations.
2. Since 2001, VOC concentrations in the northern plume area have continued to gradually decline and the extent of the plume is generally stable. For this reason, no ground water extraction has occurred in this area to date. VOC concentrations in the northern plume area are discussed further in Section 7.4.
3. Since the last Five-Year Review, total VOCs have been detected in only 4 of the 15 wells screened in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer in the Central GSA. Tnbs<sub>1</sub> well W-7P was added to the Central GSA extraction wellfield in 2005. Due to the continued very low VOC concentrations detected in the regional aquifer, additional extraction from this aquifer has not been considered. Further detail regarding VOC concentrations in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer is discussed in Section 7.4.
4. By 2005, the Eastern GSA remediation system has successfully reduced VOC concentrations in ground water to meet the MCL ground water cleanup standards. As a result, the ground water extraction and treatment system will be shut down and monitoring will be conducted to determine if VOC concentrations rebound above cleanup standards. Additional details are provided in Section 7.4.

### 5.4. Status of Other Prior Issues

There are no other prior issues.

## 6. Five-Year Review Process

The Five-Year Review of the GSA OU at LLNL Site 300 was led by Claire Holtzapple, Site 300 Remedial Project Manager for the DOE/NNSA-Livermore Site Office. The following team members assisted in the review:

- Leslie Ferry, Project Leader, LLNL
- Valerie Dibley, Deputy Project Leader, LLNL
- Vic Madrid, Environmental Scientist, LLNL
- John Valett, Geologist, Weiss Associates
- Zafer Demir, Hydrogeological Engineer, LLNL.

- William Daily, Engineer, LLNL

This Five-Year Review consisted of examining relevant project documents and site data:

- Final Site-Wide Remedial Investigation for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (Webster-Scholten et al., 1994).
- Final Feasibility Study for the General Services Area at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (Rueth and Berry, 1995).
- Proposed Plan for Remediation of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 General Services Area (DOE, 1996).
- Final Record of Decision for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (DOE, 1997).
- Cost and Performance Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (Ferry, 1997).
- Remedial Design Document for the General Services Area Treatment Facilities, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (Rueth et al., 1998).
- Building 875 Inhalation Risk Mitigation Evaluation at the Central GSA at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (DOE, 2000b).
- Eastern GSA Treatment Facility Operations Checklist (LLNL, 1999).
- Operations and Maintenance Manual, Volume VI: Central General Services Area Vapor and Ground Water Treatment Facilities (Daily, 2004).
- Five-Year Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 (Ferry, 2001).
- Quarterly Compliance Monitoring Reports for the Eastern GSA Ground Water Extraction and Treatment System (Lamarre/Yow, 2003-2005).
- Semi-annual Site-Wide Compliance Monitoring Reports that include evaluations of remediation progress in the Central GSA (Dibley et al., 2004-2005). This Five-Year Review evaluates subsurface contaminant concentration and remediation system performance data collected through calendar year 2005.

A notice informing the public that this Five-Year Review was in progress was placed in the Tracy Press on June 2006. The completed report will be placed in the information repositories in the Visitor's Center at the LLNL Livermore Site and at the Tracy Public Library. Notice of its completion will be placed in the Tracy Press and local contacts will be notified by letter.

## **7. Five-Year Review Findings**

### **7.1. Interviews and Site Inspection**

Interviews or a site inspection are not required for sites with an ongoing presence. "Ongoing presence" means that either the U.S. EPA, the State, or another agency is the lead agency for the

site and that the lead agency is involved in and knowledgeable of site activities, issues, concerns, and status. Specifically, there should be regular activity at the site, evidenced by continuing response work that is overseen by the continued presence of the lead agency or regular inspections by the lead agency.

Because the cleanup at the GSA falls within the definition of “ongoing presence” neither interviews nor a site inspection were required. However, the EPA conducted a Remedial Action Construction Completion inspection on July 13, 2005. All remedial components were determined to be operational and functional.

## 7.2. Changes in Cleanup Standards and To-Be-Considered Requirements

The following changes have been made to location-, chemical-, or action-specific requirements since the Final ROD for the GSA OU was signed in 1997:

- The Federal MCL for total trihalomethanes (TTHM) was changed from 100  $\mu\text{g/L}$  to 80  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in 2002. Table 3 lists the current cleanup standards for the GSA. The maximum TTHM concentration detected in GSA ground water in the second semester of 2005 was 5.6  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , well below the 80  $\mu\text{g/L}$  MCL for TTHM. Therefore, there is no impact on the protectiveness of the remedy related to the reduction in the TTHM MCL.
- The National Toxics Rule (NTR) was last amended on November 9, 1999. The NTR, is an applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARAR) for the discharge to Corral Hollow Creek of treated ground water from the remediation system in the Eastern GSA. However, the Eastern GSA surface water discharge will be eliminated before or by 2010, therefore there is no impact on the protectiveness of the remedy.
- The California Toxics Rule (CTR) was adopted on May 18, 2000 and amended on February 13, 2001. The CTR is an ARAR for the discharge to Corral Hollow Creek of treated ground water from the remediation system in the Eastern GSA. However, the Eastern GSA surface water discharge will be eliminated before or by 2010, therefore there is no impact on the protectiveness of the remedy.
- The State Implementation Policy (SIP) was adopted in March 2000 and modified on February 24, 2005. It contains policies and procedures for implementation of the NTR and the CTR and is also an ARAR for the discharge to Corral Hollow Creek of treated ground water from the remediation system in the Eastern GSA. However, the Eastern GSA surface water discharge will be eliminated before or by 2010, therefore there is no impact on the protectiveness of the remedy.
- The California Code and Regulations, Title 22, Section 67391.1 was adopted April 19, 2003. It contains requirements for imposing legal limitations on future site uses and activities through a land use covenant. There is no impact on the protectiveness of the remedy related to the new requirement for a land use covenant at the time of property transfer.

These changes in location-, chemical-, or action-specific requirements since the Final ROD for the GSA OU was signed in 1997 will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA ROD through a letter to the file.

### 7.3. Changes in Exposure Pathways, Toxicity, and Other Contaminant Characteristics

There have been no changes in exposure pathways, toxicity, and other contaminant characteristics since the Final ROD for the GSA OU was signed in 1997. However, in August 2001, U.S. EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) released the draft "Trichloroethylene Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterization" for external peer review. This assessment presents EPA's most current evaluation of the potential health risks from exposure to TCE. The assessment indicates that, for those who have increased susceptibility and/or higher background exposures, TCE could pose a higher risk than previously considered. Since review of the toxicity value for TCE may continue for a number of years, this issue will be updated in subsequent Five-Year Reviews.

### 7.4. Data Review and Evaluation

The effectiveness and protectiveness of the GSA OU remedy was assessed by reviewing contaminant mass removal data, concentration reduction trends over time, changes in VOC plume size and extent, and extraction system capture zones. The following sections include estimates of the prerediation mass of subsurface contaminants and compares these estimates to the mass of contaminants removed by ground water and soil vapor extraction. The estimates of VOC mass removed is carefully tracked and reported in the semi-annual compliance monitoring reports. However, the estimates of the prerediation mass of contaminants in the subsurface are presented assuming an uncertainty of  $\pm 30\%$ .

#### 7.4.1. Central GSA

##### 7.4.1.1. Ground Water

The original mass of VOCs estimated to have been present in the ground water in the Central GSA prior to the beginning of extraction (1993) was 25-47 kg. Since then, 13.5 kg of VOCs have been removed by ground water extraction, representing 28-54% of the original mass. Over 12.4 million gallons of contaminated ground water have been extracted and treated. TCE comprises approximately 90% of the extracted VOCs, PCE 5%, and other VOCs (Freon 113, 1,1-DCE, and 1,2-DCE) make up the remainder. The cumulative mass of VOCs extracted over time is shown on Figure 9. Figure 10 shows the mass of VOCs extracted each quarter since 1993. There has been a general decline in the rate of mass removal since remediation began. Mass removal is typically highest between January and July, when more ground water is available as a result of the infiltration of winter precipitation. Currently, approximately 0.4 kg of VOCs are extracted in ground water each year. Future mass removal rates are extremely difficult to predict because: (1) removal efficiency varies as a result of fluctuating ground water elevation and contaminant concentration, (2) changes in extraction well configuration affect removal rate, and (3) the mass removal rate will continue to decline as VOCs are removed from high-permeability sediments and diffuse slowly out of fine-grained materials.

Prior to remediation, the maximum total VOC concentration in Central GSA ground water was approximately 272,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (1992), compared to the current (2005) maximum of 547  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . Figure 11 is an isoconcentration contour map of total VOCs in the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Central

GSA constructed using second semester 2005 data. VOC concentrations have decreased throughout the contaminant plume. The number of wells in the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> HSU in which VOC concentrations exceed the MCL cleanup standard had decreased from 28 to 19 at the time of the 2001 Five-Year Review. By second semester 2005, this number has been further reduced to only 15 wells with VOC concentrations exceeding the MCL cleanup standard.

Figure 12 presents time-series graphs of total VOC concentrations in the following three extraction well areas: (a) the Building 875 dry well pad area, (b) the W-70 area (immediately east of the dry well pad area), and (c) the Building 872/873 dry well (W-873-07/W-872-02) area (immediately west of the dry well pad area). As shown in Figure 12, the dry well pad area is represented by well W-875-07 and shows VOC concentrations decreasing from a preremediation maximum of 107,000 µg/L to the current 382.5 µg/L. Well W-70 shows VOC concentrations decreasing from a preremediation maximum of 752 µg/L to the current 87 µg/L. Wells W-873-07 and W-872-02 show VOC concentrations decreasing from preremediation maxima of 169.7 µg/L and 122.8 µg/L, respectively to current concentrations of 22.3 µg/L and 23.8 µg/L, respectively. Adjustment of the pumping rates for wells W-873-07 and W-872-02 may be considered in the near future, to increase contaminant capture and mass removal.

The results of a capture zone analysis for the existing ground water extraction wells in the Central GSA are shown on Figure 13. The capture zones were determined from the ground water elevation map based on water levels measured during pumping. This analysis shows that the capture zones include the primary contaminant release locations and areas of highest VOC concentration. New extraction wells W-7R and W-7P are included in this capture zone analysis. It should be noted that the capture of W-7P is limited to the area immediately surrounding W-7P. This well is being pumped at a very low rate in order to prevent possible inducement of a downward gradient in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in this area.

Figure 14 presents time-series graphs of total VOC concentrations in four key wells in the northern plume area. No active remediation of the VOC plume has been conducted in this area. VOC concentrations in wells W-875-01, W-875-06 and W-876-01 have decreased from historical maxima of 211.4 µg/L, 46.9 µg/L, and 75.2 µg/L, respectively to current (2005) concentrations of 24.6 µg/L, 0.87 µg/L, and 1.8 µg/L, respectively. VOC concentrations increased in well W-889-01 to a historical maximum of 75 µg/L in April 1998, but has since decreased to a current (2005) concentration of 35.85 µg/L. The concentration trend for W-889-01 suggests that an additional source influx may have occurred in this area in the mid- to late-1990s. Well W-889-01 may be considered for conversion to an extraction well in the future if contaminant concentrations increase.

Low concentrations of VOCs are present in shallow Tnbs<sub>1</sub> ground water in the eastern portion of the Central GSA. Since the last Five-Year Review, VOCs have been detected in only 4 of the 15 wells screened in the Tnbs<sub>1</sub> regional aquifer. VOC concentrations in Tnbs<sub>1</sub> ground water have decreased from a historical maximum of 63 µg/L to 9 µg/L in the fourth quarter of 2005. TCE concentrations exceed the MCL cleanup standard in only one Tnbs<sub>1</sub> well.

Without additional actions, it is expected that future compliance with ground water cleanup standards will be achieved. The performance of the selected remedy in the Central GSA is generally consistent with modeling performed in the Remedial Design that estimated the time to reach cleanup standards would be approximately 30 years (i.e., by 2027).

#### 7.4.1.2. Vadose Zone

Soil vapor extraction has been significantly more effective than ground water extraction in removing VOC mass from the subsurface. The original mass of VOCs estimated to have been present in the vadose zone in the Central GSA prior to the beginning of extraction (July, 1994) was 73 to 136 kg. Since then, 66.72 kg of VOCs have been removed by soil vapor extraction, representing 49-91% of the original mass. The extracted VOCs are comprised almost exclusively of TCE. The cumulative mass of VOCs extracted over time is shown on Figure 9. Figure 10 shows the mass of VOCs extracted each quarter since 1994. The rate of mass removal is extremely variable, possibly as a result of: (1) temporal permeability variations in the subsurface caused by changes in vadose zone moisture content, (2) seasonal changes in the thickness of the vadose zone from fluctuating ground water levels, and/or (3) changes in the VOC concentration in extracted soil vapor as the extraction and air injection well configuration is changed. Currently, approximately 0.8 kg of VOCs are extracted in soil vapor each year. The future rate of VOC mass removal by soil vapor extraction is even more difficult to predict than that for ground water extraction.

In order to evaluate the magnitude of remaining TCE source, a soil vapor rebound test was conducted from December 2003 to October 2004. The rebound test consisted of shutting down vapor extraction for 10 months while monitoring the rebound of vapor concentrations in individual extraction wells. Table 4 presents soil vapor treatment facility influent and soil vapor extraction well data used to interpret the rebound test including: (1) the historical maximum TCE concentration, (2) the diffusion-limited TCE concentration prior to the rebound test, and the maximum TCE concentration observed during the rebound period. As shown in Table 4, the TCE concentration in the soil vapor system influent decreased from a historical maximum of 417 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> six months after startup of SVE (January 1995) to a maximum concentration of 0.3 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> prior to system shutdown for the rebound test in December 2003. Following the 10-month rebound period, the maximum TCE concentration detected in the facility influent was 1.1 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> suggesting a significant decrease in magnitude of the TCE source. Maximum influent concentrations following previous SVE shutdowns ranged between 270 and 1.1 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> and have consistently decreased over time.

The TCE concentrations in soil vapor measured in individual extraction wells screened primarily in the Tnbs<sub>2</sub> sandstone decreased from historical maxima ranging from 58 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> to 529 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> to pre-rebound test concentration ranges of 0.6 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> to 2.8 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> (Table 4). These low vapor concentrations are indicative of diffusion-limited conditions. Following the rebound test, the maximum TCE concentrations observed in the extraction wells ranged from 6 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> to 29 ppm<sub>v/v</sub>. Although some rebound of VOCs in soil vapor occurred, this data indicate that soil vapor extraction has been successful in reducing VOC mass in the Tnbs<sub>2</sub> sandstone.

TCE in soil vapor in Tnsc<sub>1</sub> extraction well W-7I decreased from a historical maximum concentration of 200 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> to a diffusion-limited TCE concentration of 2.8 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> prior to system shutdown for the rebound test. During the rebound period, TCE increased significantly to a concentration of 316 ppm<sub>v/v</sub> in soil vapor in well W-7I. Well W-7I is screened in the low-permeability Tnsc<sub>1</sub> claystone/siltstone, while the other soil vapor extraction wells are screened primarily in the overlying more permeable Tnbs<sub>2</sub> sandstone. The significant rebound of TCE soil vapor concentrations in well W-7I indicates that TCE mass remains in the low-permeability Tnsc<sub>1</sub> claystone/siltstone. In November 2005, a test of individual well vapor

flow rates indicated no flow from well W-7I, and this well has been discontinued as an SVE well. The persistence of high concentrations in W-7I and the observed low flow rate indicates that the formation ( $T_{nsc_1}$ ) in the immediate vicinity of this well exhibits very low pneumatic permeability.

The performance of the soil vapor extraction system is generally consistent with modeling performed in the Remedial Design (Rueth et al, 1998) that estimated the time to reach cleanup standards would be approximately 20 to 25 years (i.e., by 2015 to 2020). Soil vapor extraction has contributed to reducing the excess cancer risk due to inhalation of VOC vapors migrating into Building 875 from  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  prior to remediation to  $9.5 \times 10^{-7}$  in 2000. Inhalation risk within Building 875 is no longer of concern.

Future optimization of the Central GSA vapor treatment system will include:

1. Additional rebound testing to evaluate source magnitude.
2. Periodic reconfiguration of extraction versus inlet wells to optimize mass removal.
3. Installation of individual vapor flow meters to more accurately track flow and mass removal from individual wells.

#### 7.4.2. Eastern GSA

The original mass of VOCs estimated to have been present in the ground water in the Eastern GSA prior to the beginning of extraction (1991) was 0.5 to 2.3 kg. Since then, approximately 7.1 kg of VOCs have been removed by ground water extraction. The mass of VOCs extracted exceeds the preremediation estimate because: (1) ground water with higher VOC concentration than is represented by samples from monitor wells is present, resulting in an artificially low estimate of initial mass, and/or (2) undetected VOC mass is present in the vadose zone, although site characterization indicated that the VOC concentrations in unsaturated soil and bedrock are extremely low.

Over 267 million gallons of contaminated ground water have been extracted and treated. The extracted VOCs are comprised almost exclusively of TCE. The cumulative mass of VOCs extracted over time is shown on Figure 9. Figure 10 shows the mass of VOCs extracted each quarter since 1991. There has been a general decline in the rate of mass removal since remediation began. Mass removal is relatively consistent throughout the year. Approximately 0.13 kg of VOCs is extracted in ground water each year.

Recent data (2<sup>nd</sup> Semester 2005) indicate that remediation of Eastern GSA ground water has successfully reduced concentrations of TCE and other VOCs to below their MCL cleanup standards in all wells (Table 5). Since extraction and treatment began at the Eastern GSA in 1991, TCE concentrations in ground water have decreased from a historical maximum of 74  $\mu\text{g/L}$  to below analytical detection limits (0.5  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) in the majority of wells. The number of wells in which TCE concentrations exceed the MCL cleanup standard has decreased from a maximum of 18 wells to 0 wells. Figure 15 is an isoconcentration contour map of total VOCs in the shallow aquifer in the Eastern GSA constructed using 2005 data. Figure 16 is a set of time-series maps showing changes in the extent and concentrations of TCE in ground water in the Eastern GSA. The length of the TCE plume in ground water at concentrations exceeding detection limits has been reduced from 4,200 ft to 350 ft, and the portion of the plume exceeding

5  $\mu\text{g/L}$  has been eliminated. The performance of the selected remedy in the Eastern GSA is generally consistent with modeling performed in the Remedial Design phase that estimated the time to reach cleanup standards would be approximately 10 years (i.e., by 2008).

For this reason, DOE/LLNL has proposed to initiate the “Requirements for Closeout” described in the Remedial Design for the GSA Operable Unit (OU) (Rueth et al., 1998). These requirements specify that “when VOC concentrations in ground water have been reduced to cleanup standards, the ground water extraction and treatment system will be shut off and placed on standby.” As required, ground water monitoring will be conducted to determine if VOC concentrations rise or “rebound” above cleanup standards after extraction ceases. No additional action is expected to be required to achieve cleanup standards unless monitoring indicates that VOC concentrations rebound.

## 8. Technical Assessment

The protectiveness of the remedy was assessed by determining if:

- The remedy is protective of human health and the environment.
- The remedy is functioning as intended by the decision documents.
- The exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and remedial action objectives used at the time of the remedy selection are still valid.
- Any other information has come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy.

This Five-Year Review determined that the remedy for the GSA OU was protective and effectively functioning as intended in the decision documents, based on the following:

- Ground water and soil vapor extraction are effectively reducing contaminant concentrations in the subsurface. In the Central GSA, the current maximum VOC concentrations in both ground water and soil vapor have decreased by over two orders of magnitude. VOC concentrations throughout the ground water plume have declined. In the Eastern GSA, VOC concentrations in ground water have been reduced to below the MCL cleanup standard.
- DOE has removed a total of 87.4 kg of VOCs from the subsurface in the GSA OU. This represents 47-88% of the estimated prerediation mass of total VOCs present in the subsurface. Mass removal rates are declining for both ground water and soil vapor as contaminants are removed from more permeable subsurface sediment and diffuse slowly from low-permeability materials.
- Overall performance of the selected remedy in the GSA OU is consistent with expectations at the time the ROD was signed. The Central GSA extraction and treatment systems are performing as designed and will continue to be operated and optimized.
- Ground water remediation in the Eastern GSA has successfully reduced concentrations of TCE and other VOCs to below their drinking water MCL cleanup standards. Therefore, DOE/LLNL proposes to shut off the ground water extraction and treatment system and

monitor ground water to determine if VOC concentrations rise or “rebound” above cleanup standards after extraction ceases.

- System operation procedures are consistent with requirements.
- Costs have been consistently within budget.
- No early indicators of potential remedy failure were identified.
- All required institutional controls are in place.
- The Contingency Plan and the Health and Safety Plan are in place, sufficient to control risks, and properly implemented.

This Five-Year Review for the GSA OU determined that the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and remedial action objectives used at the time of the remedy selection are still valid, based on the following:

- There have been no changes in location-, chemical-, or action-specific requirements that change the protectiveness of the remedy, nor have there been changes in exposure pathways, toxicity, and other contaminant characteristics.
- There have been no changes in risk assessment methodologies that could call the protectiveness of the remedy into question.
- Soil vapor extraction at the Building 875 release site has contributed to reducing the human health risk due to inhalation of TCE vapors within nearby Building 875 to a level that is not of further concern. In September of 2000, DOE submitted the Building 875 Inhalation Risk Mitigation to the EPA, DTSC, and RWQCB. The report provided data that demonstrated that the remediation systems in the Central GSA had reduced the VOC inhalation risk inside Building 875 to below  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ , the level designated by EPA as protective of human health.
- There are no planned changes in land use at the site or planned modification or proposed development of the offsite land adjacent to the GSA.

This Five-Year Review for the GSA OU determined that no other information has come to light that calls into question the protectiveness of the remedy, based on the following:

- There are no new ecological risks, natural disaster impacts, or any other new information that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy.
- No new contaminants, source areas, or remedy by-products have been found in the GSA OU since the previous Five-Year Review.

In summary, the remedy is functioning as intended, the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and remedial action objectives used at the time of the remedy are still valid, and no new information has come to light that calls into question the protectiveness of the remedy.

## 9. Deficiencies

No deficiencies were identified during the Five-Year Review process.

## 10. Recommendations and Follow-Up Actions

The following recommendations to be carried out by the DOE were developed during the review process:

1. Because cleanup standards (MCLs) have been achieved in Eastern GSA ground water, DOE/LLNL proposes to shut off the ground water extraction and treatment system and monitor ground water to determine if VOC concentrations rebound above cleanup standards after extraction ceases. Ground water in the Eastern GSA will be monitored for a period of five years following shutdown of the ground water extraction and treatment system. If VOC concentrations in ground water increase above cleanup standards, reinitiation of remediation efforts will be discussed with the EPA, DTSC, and RWQCB. The ground water system will be restarted and operated until cleanup standards are achieved, unless DOE and the regulatory agencies agree otherwise. Several pumping cycle iterations may be required to achieve the cleanup standards.
2. If VOC concentrations in ground water rebound above their MCLs and the Eastern GSA treatment facility must be restarted, DOE/LLNL will follow the procedures outlined in the Remediation Optimization Plan (Ferry and Holtzapple, 2006) to evaluate alternate methods to address ground water contamination in the Eastern GSA that will result in the cessation of treatment facility effluent discharge to Corral Hollow Creek by March 10, 2010 as specified in Provision 6 of the Eastern GSA Substantive Requirements. The alternate methods that will be evaluated include:
  - Modifying the ground water extraction wellfield configuration and/or pumping rates from Eastern GSA wells to optimize contaminant removal so that cleanup standards are met by 2010, allowing for cessation of treatment and discharge of ground water. Extraction system modification options would be evaluated only if VOC concentrations rebound above MCLs following system shutdown.
  - Modifying the method of disposal for treatment system effluent of the Eastern GSA facility to discharge of treated ground water on LLNL property through reinjection wells, infiltration trenches, misting, or other similar technology so that the discharge to Corral Hollow Creek no longer occurs by 2010. Effluent discharge options would be evaluated to ensure that DOE/LLNL has the ability to dispose of effluent onsite if VOC concentrations rebound above MCLs and the extraction system must be restarted in the future.
3. Further optimization of Central GSA wells W-872-02 and W-873-07 operations should be considered. This may include repositioning the pumps in these wells and/or changing the pumps in order to increase ground water yield, capture, and contaminant mass removal.
4. VOC concentrations in Central GSA well W-889-01 (in the northern plume area) should be closely monitored. If concentrations increase, this well would be considered for conversion to an extraction well.
5. Optimization of the Central GSA SVE system should continue. Future optimization should include additional rebound testing to evaluate source magnitude, periodic reconfiguration of extraction versus inlet wells to optimize mass removal, and installation

of individual vapor flow meters to more accurately track flow and mass removal from individual wells.

6. Because some VOCs may remain at the Central GSA following the achievement of subsurface soil cleanup standards for VOCs, a land use control will be added that prohibits the transfer of lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm under residential or unrestricted land use. This prohibition will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA ROD through a letter to the file. This letter to the file will also reference the LLNL Site 300 Integrated Strategic Plan or other appropriate institutional planning document into which this prohibition will be incorporated.
7. The changes in location-, chemical-, or action-specific requirements identified in Section 7.2 will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA ROD through a letter to the file.

No other follow-up actions were identified related to this Five-Year Review.

## 11. Protectiveness Statement

The remedy at the GSA OU is expected to be protective of human health and the environment upon completion (i.e., when clean-up levels are achieved) for the site's industrial land use. In the short-term, the remedy protects human health because exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risk to onsite workers are being controlled by the implementation of institutional controls, the Health and Safety Plan, and the Contingency Plan.

The cleanup standards for GSA ground water are to reduce VOC concentrations to meet drinking water standards. Because drinking water standards do not differentiate between industrial and residential use, the ground water cleanup remedy will be protective under any land use scenario upon completion.

The cleanup standards for subsurface soil are to reduce VOC concentrations to mitigate risk to onsite workers and prevent further impacts to ground water to the extent technically and economically feasible. Because some VOCs may remain in subsurface soil following the achievement of these cleanup standards, a land use control will be added that prohibits the transfer of lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm under residential or unrestricted land use. This prohibition will remain in place until and unless a risk assessment is performed in accordance with then current U.S. EPA risk assessment guidance and is agreed by the DOE, the U.S. EPA, DTSC, and the RWQCB as adequately showing no unacceptable risk for residential or unrestricted land use. This prohibition will be entered into the administrative record for the GSA through a letter to the file.

## 12. Next Review


The next statutory review will be conducted within five years of the signature date of this report.

## 13. References

- Daily, W. (2004), *Operations and Maintenance Manual, Volume VI: Central General Services Area Vapor and Ground Water Treatment Facilities (VTFCGSA and TFCGSA)*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.
- Ferry, R.A., and L. Rueth (1997), *Cost and Performance Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-128479).
- Ferry, R.A., W. Daily, L. Ferry, G. Aarons, V. Madrid, J. Valett, Z. Demir (2001), *Five-Year Review Report for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-14104).
- Ferry, R.A., L. Ferry, S. Gregory, V. Madrid, J. Valett, (2002), *Five-Year Review Report for the Building 834 Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-144744).
- Ferry L. and C. Holtzapple (2005a), *Characterization Summary Report for the Building 812 Study Area at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, U.S. Department of Energy and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore Calif., 21 pp. plus attachments.
- Ferry L. and C. Holtzapple (2005b), *Characterization Summary Report for the Sandia Test Site at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, U.S. Department of Energy and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore Calif., 15 pp. plus attachments.
- LLNL (1999), *Eastern GSA Treatment Facility Operations Checklist*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.
- Ferry L. and C. Holtzapple (2006), *Remediation Optimization Plan/Implementation Schedule for the Eastern General Services Area Treatment Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, U.S. Department of Energy and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore Calif., 14 pp. plus attachments.
- Rueth, L.S., R. Ferry, L. Green-Horner, and T. Delorenzo (1998), *Remedial Design Document for the General Services Area Treatment Facilities, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-127465).
- Rueth, L.S., and T. Berry (1995), *Final Feasibility Study for the General Services Area at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-113860).
- Taffet, M.J., L. Ferry, V. Madrid, T. Carlsen, Z. Demir, J. Valett, M. Dresen, W. Daily, S. Coleman, V. Dibley (2005), *Final Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for the Pit 7 Complex at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-202492).


- U.S. DOE (1996), *Proposed Plan for Remediation of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300 General Services Area*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-122585).
- U.S. DOE (1997), *Final Record of Decision for the General Services Area Operable Unit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-124061).
- U.S. DOE (2000a), *Draft Department of Energy CERCLA Five-Year Review Guidance*, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. DOE (2000b), *Building 875 Inhalation Risk Mitigation Evaluation at the Central GSA at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.
- U.S. DOE (2001), *Interim Site-Wide Record of Decision for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-AR-138470).
- U.S. EPA (2001), *Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 540-R-01-007), OSWER Directive 9355.7-03B-P.
- U.S. EPA (2001), *Trichloroethylene Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterization* (External Review Draft), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Washington Office, Washington, DC, EPA/600/P-01/002A.
- Webster-Scholten C.P., Ed. (1994), *Final Site-Wide Remedial Investigation for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Site 300*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. (UCRL-MI-141567).

## **Figures**



ERD-S3R-06-0014

Figure 1. Locations of LLNL Site 300 and the GSA OU.



ERD-S3R-06-0005

Figure 2. Hydrologic cross-section of the General Services Area.




Figure 3. Potentiometric surface of the Qt-Tnsc<sub>1</sub> and Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSUs in the Central GSA.





Figure 4. Potentiometric surface of the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> HSU in the Eastern GSA.



ERD-S3R-06-0015

Figure 5. Contaminant release sites in the GSA.






Figure 6. Central General Services Area site map showing monitor, extraction, and water-supply wells, and treatment facilities.






ERD-S3R-06-0106

Figure 8. General Services Area (GSA) land use controls.



ERD-S3R-06-0042

Figure 9. Cumulative mass of total VOCs removed from ground water and soil vapor in the GSA.



ERD-S3R-06-0043

Figure 10. Total VOC mass removal by quarter in the GSA OU.






Figure 12. Time-series graphs of total VOCs in ground water for Central GSA extraction wells a) W-875-07 (Building 875 dry well pad area), b) W-70, and c) W-873-07/ W-872-02.





Figure 13. Ground water capture in the Central GSA.



ERD-S3R-06-0026

Figure 14. Time-series graphs of total VOCs in ground water for wells in the Central GSA northern plume area.




Figure 15. Total VOC concentration in ground water in the Qal-Tnbs<sub>1</sub> in the Eastern GSA and vicinity.




Figure 16. Time-series isoconcentration maps of TCE in ground water in the Eastern GSA.

## Tables

**Table 1. Actual annual costs for the General Services Area Operable Unit for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.**

<b>Fiscal year</b>	<b>Annual budget</b>	<b>Actual annual cost</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>\$581,408</b>	<b>\$482,788</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>\$582,081</b>	<b>\$376,723</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>\$351,855</b>	<b>\$436,654</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>\$351,369</b>	<b>\$344,792</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>\$430,131</b>	<b>\$431,000</b>

**Table 2. Description of institutional/land use controls for the General Services Area (GSA) Operable Unit (OU).**

Institutional/land use control performance objective and duration	Risk necessitating institutional/land use control	Institutional/land use controls and implementation mechanism
Prevent water-supply use/consumption of contaminated groundwater until ground water cleanup standards are met.	VOC concentrations in ground water exceeding drinking water standards.	<p><b>Central GSA:</b> There are no existing or planned water-supply wells in the Central GSA OU. Any proposed well drilling activities would be submitted to LLNL Work Induction Board, and are reviewed by LLNL Environmental Restoration Division to ensure that new water-supply wells are not located in areas of ground water contamination. Existing offsite downgradient water-supply wells are monitored monthly for contaminants of concern in ground water that could potentially impact the wells. There is a Memorandum of Understanding with owner of the offsite downgradient water-supply wells that includes point-of-use treatment if VOCs above MCLs are detected in the well.</p> <p><b>Eastern GSA:</b> In 2006, VOC concentrations in Eastern GSA ground water have been reduced to below ground water cleanup standards (drinking water MCLs) through remediation, therefore this institutional/land use control is no longer needed.</p>
Control excavation activities to prevent onsite worker exposure to VOCs in subsurface soil until it can be verified that concentrations do not pose an exposure risk to onsite workers.	Potential exposure to VOCs at depth in subsurface soil at the Building 875 dry well pad <sup>a</sup> .	<p><b>Central GSA:</b> All proposed excavation activities must be cleared through LLNL Work Induction Board and require an excavation permit. The Work Induction Board coordinates with the LLNL Environmental Restoration Division to identify if there is a potential for exposure to contaminants in the proposed construction areas. If a potential for contaminant exposure is identified, the LLNL Site 300 Hazards Control Department ensures that hazards are adequately evaluated and necessary controls identified and implemented prior to the start of work. The Work Induction Board including the LLNL Environmental Analyst will also work with the Program proposing the construction project to determine if the work plans can be modified to move construction activities outside of areas of contamination.</p> <p><b>Eastern GSA:</b> Institutional/land use controls are not necessary to prevent worker exposure to VOCs in surface and subsurface soil because concentrations are below EPA's industrial and residential Preliminary Remediation Goals.</p>

**Table 2. Description of institutional/land use controls for the General Services Area (GSA) Operable Unit (OU). (Continued)**

Institutional/land use control performance objective and duration	Risk necessitating institutional/land use control	Institutional/land use controls and implementation mechanism
Maintain engineering controls to prevent onsite site worker inhalation exposure to VOCs inside Building 875 until annual risk re-evaluation indicates that the risk is less than $10^{-6}$ .	A pre-remediation risk of $1 \times 10^{-5}$ was identified for onsite workers from potential inhalation of VOCs volatilizing from subsurface soil into ambient air inside Building 875 (Central GSA).	<p><b>Central GSA:</b> Engineering controls (heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning system for Building 875) were implemented to prevent onsite worker exposure to VOCs that could migrate from the subsurface into the building until the inhalation risk was mitigated through remediation.</p> <p>The risk has been successfully mitigated through ground water and soil vapor extraction and treatment in the Building 875 area as of 2000 (see Section 3.5), therefore this institutional/land use control is no longer needed.</p> <p><b>Eastern GSA:</b> There is no risk or hazard associated with soil in the Eastern GSA.</p>
Prohibit transfer of lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm under residential or unrestricted land use <sup>b</sup> .	Potential exposure to contaminated waste and/or environmental media.	<p>The Site 300 FFA contains provisions that assure that DOE will not transfer lands with unmitigated contamination that could cause potential harm. In the event that the Site 300 property is transferred in the future, DOE will execute a land use covenant at the time of transfer in compliance with Title 22 California Code of Regulations, Division 4.5, Chapter 39, Section 67391.1.</p> <p>Development will be restricted to industrial land usage. These restrictions will remain in place until and unless a risk assessment is performed in accordance with then current U.S. EPA risk assessment guidance and is agreed by the DOE, the U.S. EPA, DTSC, and the RWQCB as adequately showing no unacceptable risk for residential or unrestricted land use. These restrictions will be incorporated into the LLNL Site 300 Integrated Strategic Plan or other appropriate institutional planning document.</p>

**Notes:**

<sup>a</sup> Risk for onsite worker exposure to VOCs at depth in subsurface soil could not be re-calculated as there are no new subsurface soil data. Land use controls based on the potential exposure to VOCs in subsurface soil during ground-breaking construction activities conservatively assume that the VOCs in subsurface soil may pose a risk to human health.

<sup>b</sup> This prohibition will be codified as a decision through a letter to the administrative record file.

**Table 3. Chemical-specific ARARs for potential chemicals of concern in ground water at the General Services Area Operable Unit.**

Chemical of concern	1997 ROD Cleanup Standard <sup>a</sup> (µg/L)	Current MCL (µg/L)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	200	200
1,1-Dichloroethylene	6	7
Cis-1,2-dichloroethylene	6	7
Benzene	1	1
Bromodichloromethane	100 <sup>b</sup>	80 <sup>b</sup>
Chloroform	100 <sup>b</sup>	80 <sup>b</sup>
Tetrachloroethylene	5	5
Trichloroethylene	5	5

**Notes:**

ARARs = Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement.

MCL = Maximum Contaminant Level.

ROD = Record of Decision.

µg/L = Micrograms per liter.

<sup>a</sup> The GSA ROD cleanup standards are Federal or State MCLs, whichever was lower.

<sup>b</sup> Total trihalomethanes.

**Table 4. Summary of trichloroethylene (TCE) data used to evaluate Central GSA Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) performance.**

Well name	Well type	Historical maximum TCE concentration (ppm <sub>v/v</sub> )	Date of historical maximum	Concentration prior to rebound test (ppm <sub>v/v</sub> )	Rebounded maximum concentration (ppm <sub>v/v</sub> )	Flow <sup>a</sup> (scfm)
TF-GSA2-IV <sup>b</sup>	NA	417	1/18/95	0.3	1.1 <sup>c</sup>	22 <sup>d</sup>
W-875-07	Vapor Extraction	529	7/21/94	1.8	29	3.1
W-875-08	Vapor Extraction	249	7/25/94	1.6	12	2.8
W-875-09	Vapor Inlet	241	10/29/97	0.6	25	NA
W-875-10	Vapor Extraction	293	7/25/94	0.6	6	14
W-875-11	Vapor Inlet	58	10/29/97	1.1	6.8	NA
W-875-15	Vapor Inlet	120	10/29/97	1	14	NA
W-7I	Vapor Extraction	200	10/29/97	2.8	316	Too low to measure

**Notes:**

scfm = Standard cubic feet per minute.

NA = Not Applicable.

<sup>a</sup> Flow as measured during the test conducted during November 2005.

<sup>b</sup> Influent.

<sup>c</sup> Maximum influent concentration after SVE system was re-started following rebound test (December 2004).

<sup>d</sup> Average of weekly flows of the influent for the month of November 2005.



**Table 5. Volatile organic compound (VOC) results from the analysis of ground water samples collected from Eastern and Central GSA monitor wells, second semester 2005. (Continued)**

Sample location	Sample date	Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	Chloroform (µg/L)	1,1-DCA (µg/L)	1,2-DCA (µg/L)	1,1-DCE (µg/L)	cis-1,2-DCE (µg/L)	trans-1,2-DCE (µg/L)	Freon 113 (µg/L)	PCE (µg/L)	1,1,1-TCA (µg/L)	TCE (µg/L)	Freon 11 (µg/L)	Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	1,1,2-TCA (µg/L)	Total VOCs (µg/L)
W-25N-01	9-Aug-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.95</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.95</b>
W-25N-01	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.89</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.89</b>
W-25N-04	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-05	12-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.4</b>
W-25N-05	12-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.2</b>
W-25N-06	12-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.62</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.62</b>
W-25N-07	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-07	4-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-08	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>
W-25N-09	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-10	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-10	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-10	4-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-11	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-11	4-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-12	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-12	4-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-13	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-13	4-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-15	8-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-18	8-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-20	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-21	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-22	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-23	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-24	9-Aug-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3</b>
W-25N-24	17-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.9</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.9</b>
W-25N-25	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-26	8-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-26	8-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-25N-28	12-Dec-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-26R-01	27-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.54</b>	<0.5	<b>4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.54</b>
W-26R-01	27-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>	<0.5	<b>4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.56</b>
W-26R-01	17-Oct-05	<0.5	<b>2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3.5</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.5</b>
W-26R-02	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-26R-03	9-Aug-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.7</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.7</b>
W-26R-03	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>
W-26R-04	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.58</b>	<0.5	<b>4.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.18</b>
W-26R-04	17-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.65</b>	<0.5	<b>4.3</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.95</b>
W-26R-04	17-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.63</b>	<0.5	<b>4.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.83</b>
W-26R-05	26-Jul-05	<0.5	<b>1</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1</b>

**Table 5. Volatile organic compound (VOC) results from the analysis of ground water samples collected from Eastern and Central GSA monitor wells, second semester 2005. (Continued)**

Sample location	Sample date	Carbon tetrachloride ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Chloroform ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1-DCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,2-DCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	cis-1,2-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	trans-1,2-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Freon 113 ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	PCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1,1-TCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	TCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Freon 11 ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Vinyl chloride ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1,2-TCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Total VOCs ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
W-26R-05	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<b>1.4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2</b>
W-26R-06	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.69</b>	<0.5	<b>4.4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.09</b>
W-26R-06	17-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.59</b>	<0.5	<b>3.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.19</b>
W-26R-07	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-26R-08	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-26R-11	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.96</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.96</b>
W-26R-11	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>
W-35A-01	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3.6</b>	<0.5	<b>60</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>65.31</b>
W-35A-01	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3.9</b>	<0.5	<b>62</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>68.25</b>
W-35A-01	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>8.7</b>	<0.5	<b>140</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>153.6</b>
W-35A-02	28-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-02	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-03	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-04	3-Aug-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-04	12-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-05	12-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-06	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-07	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-08	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-09	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3.5</b>
W-35A-09	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>3.2</b>
W-35A-10	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>33</b>
W-35A-10	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>34</b>
W-35A-11	6-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-12	6-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-13	5-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-35A-14	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7A	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7B	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7B	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7C	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7D	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7DS	25-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7DS	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7E	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7ES	25-Jul-05	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>
W-7F	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>
W-7F	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.7</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.7</b>
W-7G	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7G	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7H	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5

**Table 5. Volatile organic compound (VOC) results from the analysis of ground water samples collected from Eastern and Central GSA monitor wells, second semester 2005. (Continued)**

Sample location	Sample date	Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	Chloroform (µg/L)	1,1-DCA (µg/L)	1,2-DCA (µg/L)	1,1-DCE (µg/L)	cis-1,2-DCE (µg/L)	trans-1,2-DCE (µg/L)	Freon 113 (µg/L)	PCE (µg/L)	1,1,1-TCA (µg/L)	TCE (µg/L)	Freon 11 (µg/L)	Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	1,1,2-TCA (µg/L)	Total VOCs (µg/L)
W-7I	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<0.5	<b>23</b>	<0.5	<b>400</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>473.08</b>
W-7I	12-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>6</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<0.5	<b>4.2</b>	<0.5	<b>380</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>413.7</b>
W-7J	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7K	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7L	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7M	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7N	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.56</b>
W-7O	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.4</b>	<0.5	<b>63</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>69.23</b>
W-7O	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.6</b>	<0.5	<b>79</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>87.22</b>
W-7P	12-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.3</b>	<0.5	<b>18</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>19.3</b>
W-7P	12-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.4</b>	<0.5	<b>19</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>20.4</b>
W-7P	1-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.65</b>	<0.5	<b>8.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>8.85</b>
W-7PS	1-Aug-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>
W-7PS	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2</b>
W-7Q	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.5</b>	<0.5	<b>33</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>37.5</b>
W-7Q	18-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.4</b>	<0.5	<b>47</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>52.4</b>
W-7R	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>
W-7R	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.8</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.8</b>
W-7S	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7S	25-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7T	11-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-7T	2-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-843-01	16-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-843-02	16-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-872-01	16-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-872-01	16-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-872-02	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>6.8</b>	<b>17</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>23.8</b>
W-873-01	14-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-873-02	14-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>26</b>
W-873-03	14-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-873-04	7-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-873-06	14-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.7</b>
W-873-07	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>6.9</b>	<b>19</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>25.9</b>
W-873-07	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>7.3</b>	<b>15</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>22.3</b>
W-875-01	12-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>	<0.5	<b>23</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>24.6</b>
W-875-02	12-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-875-04	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-875-05	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-875-06	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.87</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.87</b>
W-875-07	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.72</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>12</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>47</b>	<0.5	<b>370</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.72</b>	<b>434.24</b>
W-875-07	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>5.5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<0.5	<b>10</b>	<0.5	<b>350</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>382.36</b>

**Table 5. Volatile organic compound (VOC) results from the analysis of ground water samples collected from Eastern and Central GSA monitor wells, second semester 2005. (Continued)**

Sample location	Sample date	Carbon tetrachloride ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Chloroform ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1-DCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,2-DCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	cis-1,2-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	trans-1,2-DCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Freon 113 ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	PCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1,1-TCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	TCE ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Freon 11 ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Vinyl chloride ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	1,1,2-TCA ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Total VOCs ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
W-875-08	14-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>4.5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<0.5	<b>3.5</b>	<0.5	<b>300</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>325</b>
W-875-08	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>6.8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<0.5	<b>0.95</b>	<0.5	<b>380</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>407.95</b>
W-876-01	11-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.8</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.8</b>
W-879-01	7-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-889-01	7-Nov-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.85</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>35</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>35.85</b>
W-CGSA-1733	12-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.4</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>2.4</b>
W-CGSA-1733	26-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.1</b>	<0.5	<b>7.2</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>8.3</b>
W-CGSA-1736	26-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>0.73</b>	<0.5	<b>5.3</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>6.03</b>
W-CGSA-1737	26-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
W-CGSA-1739	12-Jul-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.5</b>
W-CGSA-1739	26-Oct-05	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<b>1.6</b>

**Other VOCs detected, but not reported as total VOCs.**

Sample location	Sample date	Bromodichloromethane ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Bromoform ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Dibromochloromethane ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
W-26R-01	17-Oct-05	1.3	3.4	0.9
W-35A-04	12-Oct-05		0.64	

**Notes:**

1,1-DCA = 1,1-Dichloroethane.

1,2-DCA = 1,2-Dichloroethane.

1,1-DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene.

cis-1,2-DCE = cis-1,2-Dichloroethene.

trans-1,2-DCE = trans-1,2-Dichloroethene.

PCE = Tetrachloroethene.

1,1,1-TCA = 1,1,1-Trichloroethane.

TCE = Trichloroethene.

1,1,2-TCA = 1,1,2-Trichloroethane.

 $\mu\text{g/L}$  = Micrograms per liter.